G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1915.

(Puzzai)

File No. 302-15

Serial Nos. 1-8.

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1— 8.

Part B for Dec. 1916.

SUBJECT.

Villages granted to the late Jemadar Venkataramiah of Serangapatam for the upkeep of Balamuri AmmaChatram at the place.

Do. Petitioner G. Bhagirathamma of Serangapatam. Dt. 15/4. D. 26-12-16.

Informs her that Govt. see no reason to interfere in the matter as the village is a personal inam.

W D 68—GPB—50,000—24-7-16

D.R. Appadurai
Sec. VII D 1-1-1

G. R. S. 11] 1915-16

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Inam)

NOTES.

File No. 302 -15

FILE HEADING.

Village granted to the late Freydar Venkatā-ramaniah of Serangapatam for the upkeep of Balamani Annachatram, Serangapatam

From

Bhojanathamma, Grand daughter-in-law of the late Freydar Venkatā ramaniah, Serangapatam

No. petn Dated 19-10-15 Received

Diary No. 786	Enclos.	Spare Copies.	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Prays that the village granted to the late Freydar Venkatā ramaniah for the upkeep of Balamani Annachatram founded by him may be ordered to be taken over under Govt. management.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

P.T.

NOTES—First Sheet.

GPB—20,000—3-8-11

G.R.S. 13]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions etc. not intended for permanent record.]

Petn from the Devasthanam—

D. No: 736 dt 19.10.15

Bhagirathamma, wife of one Sridharmurthi, son of the late Jeyadar Venkatarāmanaiah of Srikakulam Dt, stating that Balamani & two other villages in the Srikakulam Dt were granted by the late Highness Krishna Raj Wadiyar towards the upkeep of Balamani Amma chattram founded by the late Jeyadar, but that the income of the villages in question are not being utilized properly by one Srirāmma, a descendant of the late Jeyadar in the female line, and praying that arrangements may be ordered to take the villages under Govt management and endow the same to the temple

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be copied or slips pasted on this form

GPB—50.Jubilee-8-15

G.R.S. 13]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc. not intended for permanent record.]

Sree Sivalakshmana Swami of Chandagal in the same Dt, granted by the late Zamindar.

The petn says that after satisfying the requirements of the charities, for the upkeep of which the villages were granted, the surplus income, if any may be made over to Sivaramma appd to by the petr during her life time.

Draft- on to the D C of Nyme for dis'bal or report if necessy - Subs with draft- endorst to the petn.

19.11.15

22 11 15

24/11

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied or slips pasted on this form

GPB—50,000—5-8-15

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 302 of 1915.

	Serial No.	
	2	No: 1386 dt 4·12·15, fr the Collr of Mysore, for the above for ~~report~~ a detailed report. No: 1387 dt 4·12·15, to the petnr - intimating the above thereon.
dtpds	3	Petn dt 19·10·15 - addressed to H H the Maharajah - by Bhagiratha - Thamma of Srirangapatnam. This petn is almost a copy of Sl, above, which has been forwd by Collr, Mysore for report in Sl 2 above - Draft-one to the Dy Collr in compn of this office No 1386 dt 4·12·15 Subd - No Endorst appears to be necessy, as one is already sent to the petnr in Sl 2 above. Sg. anns 9.12.15
gns	4	No: 1451 dt 13·12·15 from Dy Collr of Mysore, for the above for report in compn of Sl 2 above - Dssnd Sg 9.12
	5	From, the Dy. Commr, Mysore Dist Letter no. 662 dt 30·6·1916. Reports that for reasons given in his letter, Govt cannot interfere

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—20,000—30-6-15

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 32 2 of 191 5

Serial No.

in the matter.

The Dy. Comrs letter explains the facts of the case.

In the fair rent register of Seringapatam Taluk, the jodi villages of Balamuri, Majigepura and Yedatittu alleged to have been given for Balmuri chattram, are noted as "Personal" inam in the enjoyment of one Siriamma of Mysore. The petr Bhagirathamma pleads her inability to substantiate her allegation by documentary evidence. The Special Shirastedar of Seringapatam Taluk reports that the jodi villages are not Devadaya inam as represented but were intended for personal benefit. The Dy. Comrs reports that Govt. cannot interfere in the matter.

If directed, an extract from the inam register pertaining to these villages, will be called for.

Submitted for order.

30 10 16 31/10/16

Dr. Call for the register extract of Balmuri village

1.11.16

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—70,000—17-12 15

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 302 of 1915

Serial No.

Submd. with a dft. to the Inam Supdt. for appl
N (R&C) 1.11.1916
anm 2/11/16
Ald
Ke
2.11.16

6 No 1139 dt 8.11.16, to the Supdt of Inams, calls for an extract of the Inam register of the village in question.

7 From, the Inam Supdt.
Letter no. 60 dt 5.12.16.

Submits a copy of the Inam register pertaining to the village of Balamuri in justion.

The village in justion is a personal one, intended for personal benefit.

There seems to be nothing in the Inam register to show that the village was intended for the Chattram.

Submd
N (R&C)
8.12.1916.

May an endorsement issue to the petitioner Bhagiralamma to the effect that Govt see no reason to interfere in the matter as the village is a personal Inam
9.12.16

Yr. Dept.
Ke
11.12.16

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—70,000—17-12-15

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 302 of 1915.

Serial No.

Submitted with a draft endorsement to the petitioner for appl.

MR. 13.12.16. 13/12/16

The extract of the Inam Register put up in the file goes fully into the question. There were two Sanads in connection with the grant of the villages in question. In the first a mention is made about the Balumi chatram but this Sanad was Cancelled by a subsequent one as the grantees were unable to bring the villages under cultivation and the villages were separated to Kukkala ramanaiya. In the latter the villages were [illegible] in Kasangutta Sthalam mania tenure and no mention is made about the Balumi chatram of the Kasi chatram. On the facts of the case the Inam Supdt. appears to have rightly decided the grant. Vide his personal notes.

An endorsement of the petitioner is put up for approval or other orders

(Mr. Member)

lca 18.12.16

Draft approved by the First Member 19.12.16

1170 19.12.16

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

lca 12.12.16

GPS 50,000-17.12.15

WD 1233—GPB—60,000—1-12-16—S.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 302 of 1915 ~~1916~~

Serial No.	
8	No : 1574 dt 26-12-16, to the petr. informing her that-just-as no reason to interfere in the matter as the village is a personal inam.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY
21 OCT. 1915
TO H. H. THE MAHAR

ಸುಬ್ಬೆಯಂಕರ ಊರು ; ನಗೆಡಂಬಳಕ್ಕೆ ಹತ್ತಿರದ ಎಕ್ಕಳ.

10

ಬಾಂಬಂದಿರಾಯ ಬೀಗುವಂಯ, ಕೆಂಬುಬರಡಲ್ಲಿ ದ್ಯಾಳಿ ಎಂಬ
ಅಗೆಬಲದ ಹೆಸ್ಸಾಳ ಹಾಳಕೆರೆ ಉದ್ದಕೆ ಕಂಡಲ ಕಲ್ಲಿಳಿಸಿ
ಗಂಡರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಂತು ಕಾಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಊರವರು ಆ ಬಲ್ಲೆಯಂತೆ
ಸುಳಿಗಳನ್ನು ತಡೆಯಿಸಿದರು.

ಈ ಕಂಲಾಭಿ ಎರಿಕೆಯಳನ್ನು ಕಾಣುವಲ್ಲಿ ಬಲ್ಲವರು ಆ ಗಂ
ಯಲ್ಲಿನ ಬಲ್ಲೆಯನ್ನು ಎಂಬದು ಸಂಬುಸಲೆಯ ಸ್ಮರಣೆಗೆ
ಗೆ ಕಂಡಿಯಂಲ ಊರಿನ ಹೆಂಬಳ್ಳಿ ಪರಿಸರಗಳನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆ
ಗಳಿಂಲ ಗ್ರಾಮಸಮೃದ್ಧಿಯನ್ನು ಪುರುಷಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ
ಗವರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳನ್ನು ಬಿಚ್ಚಿ ... ಎಂದು ಪಲ್ಲವಿಸಿದ್ದ ಪದಗಳಿಗೆ
ಪ್ರಗ್ರಾಮಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾರಂಬಿಗೆ ಹಾಂಕರಿಸಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಊರ್ಜಿತ ಊರ್ಜಿ
ಭೀಮಕಾಂ ಮತ್ತು ಕಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ರಾಂತಿಕಾರಾಂಶ ಸಂಭವ
ನೈಸರ್ಗಿಕ ಪರಿಸರವನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಎಂಬ ಪಲ್ಲವಿಯ

5. ಬಾಂಬಂದಿರಾಯಂ ಅಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವನ ಕಾಲ
ಅಂಯ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಊರಿನ ಸಭೆಗಳು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕಳೆದು
ಕೊಂಡವು. ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯ
ಮಾಯವಾಯಿತ

ಈ ಭಿಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ನಡೆಯಲು ಅನುಮತಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೋರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಲು ಸಹಕರಿಸಿದ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸಹೃದಯ ಬಂಧುಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಾಗೂ ಸಂಘಟಕರಿಗೆ ಹಾಗೂ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಪದಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಹೃದಯಪೂರ್ವಕ ಧನ್ಯವಾದಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಮುಂದಿನ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಹಕಾರ ನೀಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೋರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಧನ್ಯವಾದಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ

ಇಂತಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ

ಶ್ರೀ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಸಿದ್ದಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ

ಅಂಗಡಿ ಸಿದ್ದಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ

19/10/15

25/11

2 & 15

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM. 4.12.15

No. 1386 Ex-1-23 15-2

The accompanying Petition Registered
No. 786 dated 19.10.15
received at the General and Revenue
Secretariat from Bhagiathamma
wife of one Srihara murthi
son of the late Faujdar Venka
-Varamanaiah, Secunderabad
praying that Balamuri &
two other villages, granted
to the above Faujdar for the
upkeep of the Balamuri
Amma chatram presently
being, may be ordered to be
taken, ~~and encumbrances cleared~~
made over to the Sree Gopala
Krishna Swami, Temple
under the Management of
in the same &

is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures,~~
to the Dy. Comm.r of
Mysore
for ~~the~~ a detailed ~~Report if necessary~~
in the matter for early
disposal.

By Order

Secretary Govt.
Rev. Dept.
22-11-15

BANGALORE,
.....191

P. T. O.

SPB-1,000-12-14

No 1387 Dt 4.12.1915.

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್.....ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು

.....ಹೋಬಳಿ

.....ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿರುವ

ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸ್ಮೆಂಟು.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಗುಜರಾಯಿಸಿಕ್ಕೊಂಡ 19.10.15 ರಲ್ಲಿ

ಮರುಮ್ಮಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಬಗ್ಗೆ

.....

.....ರವರ ಬಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ.

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

By Order,

for Secretary.

Revenue Dept.

22-11-15

No. 1537/1

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY
TO HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,

Mysore 25. 10. 1915

DIARY No. 908

1915-16
SECTION Genl
FILE No. 302-15
SERIAL No. 3

DIARY No. 2456.

Petition as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, is transferred to the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, General and Revenue Department (Br: I), Bangalore for disposal.

I
26/10

No. 351 of 15. 16.

By Order,

Recommended

~~I.C.S.~~

Private Secretary
to H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

GBPM—200—23-4-15

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No 1451 Gen. & Rev. Dy 13/12/915
In 2 302-15-4
The accompanying Petition Registered

No 908 dated 19.10.15

received at the General and Revenue Secretariat from Bhagirathamma grand-daughter of the late Foujdar Venkalāra-maniah of Srirangapatam praying that Balamuri and other inam villages granted to the late Foujdar for the upkeep of an Anna chattram at Balamuri may be ordered to be taken under Govt. management etc

is forwarded, together with its enclosures,

to the Deputy Comr of Mysore for report

~~forwarded~~ in favour of this office No 13869 dt 4.12.15 in the matter

By Order,

Secretary. Govt. Rev Dept

Comm 9.12.15

BANGALORE,
_____191 .

P. T. O.

W D 682—GPB—1,000—10 11-15

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್_____ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು

_____ಹೋಬಳಿ

_____ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿರುವ

_____ಗೆ

ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸ್ಮೆಂಟು.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಗುಜರಾಯಿಸಿಕ್ಕೊಂಡ _____

ಮರ್ತ್ತುವಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು_____ಬಗ್ಗೆ

_____

_____ರವಕ ಬಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ.

By Order,

Secretary

GPB—50,000—17-9'15

19 16

DIARY No. 97

19 16 19 17
SECTION Mud
FIL No. 302-15
SERIAL No. 35

From The Deputy Commissioner
Bijapur Dist

To The Revenue Secretary
to Govt
Bombay

Dated 30.6.16.

Despatched

Received

General No. 6
No.

Enclosure No.

Report read for reasons that it is not desirable to interfere in the matter of letting out under Govt. management the village of Balamuri to be granted to Dorji Dar Kutabrawan for the upkeep of Jama Masjid at Bijapur.

Office of the Dy. Commissioner
Mysore District

No. 662
Dated 30-6-1916.

From

A. Subrahmanya Iyer, B.A., B.L.,
Dy. Commissioner
Mysore District

To, V. V. Thyagaraja Iyer, B.A., M.A.
Revenue Secretary to Govt.
of H. H. the Maharaja
Mysore
Nuzvid Branch

Sir,

Adverting to your C. M. No. 1396 Revs. 302-15-2 dated 4th December 1915 forwarding for report petition from Bhagirathamma of Seringapatam praying that Kalmanni & 2 other villages granted to Jonzdar Venkatramana for the upkeep of the Balamni Ramachattram founded by him may in view to be taken under Govt. Management, I have the honour to state that from Ittella No. 469 dated 19-5-16 of the Special Sheristadar of Seringapatam Taluk received with French Roads Sub-Dr. Office's Yadi No. 346 dated 27-5-1916, it is seen that the villages in question were granted as Inam in favor of Ejirayamma for benefit and were not granted Devadaya as represented by petitioner

Bhagirathamma (vide also the Final Quit rent register of the Srirangapatana Taluk, pages 2 & 3). Her father who appeared before the Sheristadar has deposed in the same terms as contained in her petition, but has failed to substantiate her allegation.

In these circumstances it appears that Govt cannot interfere in the matter.

The petition received with the above is herewith returned.

I have the honor to be.
Sir
Your most obedient servant

Dy Commissioner

Mysore 12th D

I Calls for an extract of the Inam register relating to Jodi Balamuri Village

G. R. S. 26]

3/11

19 File No. 302
Serial No. 6915

Diary No. of letter replied to 97

No. 1139

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
, the 191 .

To

The Supdt of Inam Settlements in Mysore,

Date of issue 8-11-1916.

Signed by M.G. Narasimhaiyangar

Sir,

I am directed to request that you will be so good as to furnish this office with an extract of the Inam register pertaining to the Inam under Title-deed no. 1/3 dated 1st December 1880, of the Jodi Village of Balamuri in Balagola Hobli of the Seringapatam Taluk, as personal inam to one

over.

SUBJECT.

Giriamma of Mysore - ~~I am~~
to add that a claim has been
preferred that the jodi village
of Balamari was originally
granted as Dharmadaya
for the exclusive benefit of
the chattram in the village and
to request that records if any
pertaining to the original grant
which may throw light on
the original character of the
inam may also be kindly
sent up for reference
at an early date.

I have etc.

2.11.16

DV/ am 2/11/16. for General Secretary.

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

GPE—20,000—10-10-14

WD 067—GPB—200—20-4-16

No. 65
Enc. one

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF
INAM SETTLEMENTS IN MYSORE.

Bangalore, 5th November 1916.

DIARY No. 935

19 16 19 17
SECTION MW2
FILE NO. 302-4-5
Bangalore
SERIAL No. 7

D. K. DARASHAH, ESQ., B.A.,
Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore,

To

D. M. Narasinga Rao, Esqr., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
General *Department.*

SIR,

As requested in your letter No. 1139 Inam. 302.15.6 dated 8th November 1916 I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of the Inam Register pertaining to the grant of Godi village of Balamuri in the Seringapatam Taluk as personal inam to Giriamma of Mysore.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
D K Darashah
Superintendent of
Inam Settlements

Register sheet No.... 12 .....

Taluk..... Athagram .....

Sammat..... Balagola .....

Village..... Balamuri (Jodi) .

GPB—75 books—7-5-14

Copy of the Register of Inams in the village of Balamuri Godi in the

CLASS, EXTENT AND VALUE OF INAM

Number of case or entire holding under one grant in this village	General class to which the Inam belongs	Survey No and name of field or fields comprised in the grant Dry, wet or garden	Extent	
			Local measure. Even where the local measure is in acres, guntas and annas, it is to be entered in this column	Measure in acres and their fractions in decimals
1	2	3	4	5
1	Personal	—	—	—

Sammat of Balagola in the Taluk of Astagram

DESCRIPTION, TENURE AND

Old assessment	Survey assessment	Description of Inam	
Where no survey has been made and no assessment fixed by Government, the cess paid by the raiyats to the Inamdar, or the average assessment of similar Government land, should be entered in column 7		If for service, it is to be stated whether the service is continued If for tanks, buildings, etc., whether they are efficiently kept up Hereditary or for life	Whether free of tax, etc. or liable to quit-rent, *i.e.*, jodi etc., amount of latter to be entered
6	7	8	9

P. T. U Rs. A. P.

Benir as per Meerzi Jori accounts of 1833 } 20 — = 58-2-11

Deduct Benir on Jori Lives — nil

20 — = 58-2-11

Balance

Benir as per the grant as per Kaifiat account of 1826 } 395-9-15½ = Rs 1151-15-10

For personal benefit

Rs A. P Rs. A. P

Jori on the grant 204-1 — = 593-12 — . 408-6-6

in exchange of Jori of Bakali C (Jody zadatithy) village as per Taluk Sala Shade account of 1876-77.

in the District

DOCUMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE INAM

By whom granted and in what year	Written instruments in support of the claim, original sannad, all miscellaneous documents, and other proofs of long possession. In this column it should be stated whether the Inam is held with or without grant, whether the grant is produced or lost, etc., and the general specification of terms of all documents produced should be given.
10	11
— vide —	Translation of a Nirup issued by His late Highness the ~~Raja~~ Maha raja to Tammaraya Amildar of both the Ashtagram. Dated 6th Sravana Bahula year Virodhi. Argi written was duly received from which it would appear that under the order (Nirup) dated Monday 14th Ashadha Sudda year Vikrama granting Anudagatore village attached to Allapatna in the Astagram Taluk to Krishna Char, Kempegowda, Madhavarayachar, Subbachar and others on an assessment of 326 Pagodas + 1 3/4 Fanams on 5 years Shraya tenure in view to their improving the village which was going to decay and bringing the lands under cultivation and directing to recover the Candayam according to their Consent and to Continue the village to them on Kayem gutha tenure, the Said Krishna Char and others were but ~~in possession~~ of the village; but that they

Coned not collect ryots and bring the Lands under cultivation. That the aforesaid four individuals therefore executed a Stamped bond to Fowdar Venkataramanaiah, handed over the Sannad and left the village. Consequently the Fowdar at a heavy expense brought the ryots, Settled them in the village, improved it, Constructed house, got cattle, formed Panya and has been paying the Gutta amount. That under the Nirup dated Sunday 11th Sravana Bahula of the year Eswara, granting Dry villages Majjigepura and Balamuri Kurab Koppal, Yedatittu, Dodkuru, Kaggilipura, Rama-kura and Kote-kura in all 4 Kuras (islands) and 2 dry villages Situated near the Balamuri Chattram, Balgul Hobly in the Mysore Astagram Taluk to Narasaya Murthiyachar Aswathachar and other Brahmins and directing to recover annual Kayemgutta of Pag. 204 of Fan 1 from them and to utilize the Same for the Balamuri Chattram and to Continue them to the persons on Srotriya gutta further authorizing to alienate the village to other on Such terms that Govt may not incur any loss, in case those persons refusing the grant and going away, Brahmins were put in possession of the village. They being unable to get the Lands cultivated the villages went to decay, the Lands were lying fallow and they could not pay Gutta amount. They therefore gave a Stamped Karar with the Sanads of

Col: 11 Contd

of the villages to Fowzdar Venkataramaniah
Then the Fowzdar paid arrears of the qutta
besides the large amount spent in bringing
the lands under cultivation and he has been
paying the Kayemqutta amount to Govt. Thus
there is one's name in the account in both the
Astagrams according to the Sanads whereas
the Fowzdar enjoys the village on payment
of Govt patta. The Samadars of Mundagatoré
have petitioned that their names should be re-
tained in the Kayemqutta accounts. Now there-
fore forward Sanad of Mundagatoré Stamped
Karar executed by them to the Fowzdar, Sanad
of Kayemqutta Dod. Kura and other villages
and Stamped Karar executed by them and
Solicit instructions for future guidance.
Sanads as also the Karars executed by
them having been per Comptroller's Extract and heard the Fowzdar
perused
in detail at Huzur it is hereby ordered that
the grants were made at the request of the
Fowzdar but not on account of the grantees.
That they have executed Karar owing to their
inability to bring them under cultivation.
That they should therefore be ordered that the
right in question, could not be reverted to them.
That Majjigepura, Kurubar Koppal, Yeditittu
Dod-Kuru, Rama Kuru, Kaggalipura and
Hole Kura situated near the Balamuri Ama-
Chattram, and also Mundagatoré belonging
to both the Astagrams should be continued
to the Fowzdar Venkataramaniah and

Col: II Contd.

his descendants as Kayemgutta Srotriya manya and that Kayemgutta amount of 204 and 1/7 p on the former villages and Sraya Bhatti 326 - 1 3/4 and in all 530 Pagodas and 2 3/4 Fanams. Shoud be recovered from him annually. That gratutous Services need not be required from these villages. That Inudagatore Sannad their Karar, the Sannad of Balamuri, Yedatittu Dod. Kuru etc., which you forwarded are returned in view to their being given to Venkata-ramaniah. This original Sannad Shoud also be given to Venkataramaniah after taking copy for reference in the accounts of Shirastedars of the Astagram.

Dated 20th August 1829 - Written ~~~ Venkatesiah Munshi Huzur.

As ordered above three dry villages and four Kuras (islands) Situated in both the Astagram Shoud be continued to Venkataramaniah and his descendants on Kayemgutta tenure on five hundred and thirty Pagodas and two and three quarter fanams.

(Sd) Sri Krishna

of

NAME AND RELATIONSHIP OF ORIGINAL GRANTEE AND

Name of original grantee	Name entered in the register prepared by Purniah up to 1810	Name entered in the accounts subsequent to 1810
12	13	14
Sy. Pymaishy — nil —		H. Jody and Kayem gutta village of 1826 Anajgetma & Balamuri Kuttha which were Continued for Balamuri amachattra.
		Asli 2
		Kura 4
Narasimha char & 5 Sum		
Beriz	— — — —	395-9-15½
of which deduct Luksan		
Jasti etc,	— — — —	191-8-15½
Balance Jody		204-1-0
H. Jody acct of 1833		
Balamuri Kothalu Talaghati Brahmins for		Balamuri amachattra
		P. 7. U. 20-0-0

OF SUBSEQUENT AND PRESENT HOLDERS

Particulars regarding present owner. If the inam has been subdivided, the name, etc, of each sharer should be entered in the columns			
Residence, name and age, etc.	Relation to original grantee or subsequent registered holders	Surviving heirs of the present incumbent	If unconnected with the original holders, possession how obtained, and in what year
15	16	17	18
Mysore Giriamma 35	Daughter-in-law of Narasimhachary — Donee & alienee.	—	Narasimhachar her father-in-law is said to have been obtained 2/5 share in gift from Venkatamma widow of ashwatha-char and Subbaraya-char on 30 April 1844. Plain deed on which penalty of Stamp levied is produced. He again is said to have purchased the remaining 2/5 share for Rs 100 from Krishnachar Son of Venkatarayachar and venkatasubbachar Son of ammanthatheerthachar ~~respectively~~ respectively on 25 October 1848. Deeds on which penalty of Stamp levied are produced. 1/5 is said to have been inherited.

LENGTH OF POSSESSION

Abstract of the orders already issued by the Commissioner or the Superintendent of the Division on lapses regarding validity or excess of the Inam. Assistant's opinion and recommendation	Review by the Special Assistant and confirmation by the Inam Commissioner
19	20

A. asli Case.

1. This grant is involved in a lengthy and tedious Contension and it is necessary that the nature of the dispute should be noted here to draw a right Conclusion which of the liligants is a rightful owner to the grant.

2. One Raghavendra Rao agent of Giriamma wanted to file the usual Statement for this grant. One Seshagiri Rao pensioned Amildar the guardian of a great grandson of Fouzdar Venkataramiah objected the Statement being given to the said agent and Stated that the great grandson of Fouzdar Bheema Rao is a rightful owner to file the usual Statement and he produced certain papers in Support of his allegation. Each party had their own documents to have their claims. I was obliged to Send for the proceedings Connected with their dispute and read the important papers.

The main fact of the dispute is as follows as gathered from the proceedings.

On the issue of a Circular order directing all the inamdars and Jodidars to appoint an agent

Col: 19 Contd.

to their respective villages. Giriamma nominated one individual as an agent to the Balamuri and other goodi villages and intimated the same to the Amildar for approval: but before this nomination would be confirmed Sridhara Rao late father of the aforesaid Bheema Rao presented petitions protesting against the appointment made by Giriamma on the ground that she had no right over the goodi in question and that she was only a widow of the Gumasta Sub Rao under the Service of his (Complts.) grand father Jonnalagadda Venkataramiah

Late Sridhara Rao, it appears admitted that originally the villages in question were granted on goodi tenure to Narasimha murthi the father-in-law of Giriamma as well as to certain others by H. Late H. the Maharaja at the request of his grand father then the Amildar of the Astagram Taluk, but that the villages were subsequently transferred to his grand father by a nirup dated 20th August 1829 by late H. H. because Samadars were unable to cultivate the Lands of the villages and pay the Stipulated goody to Govt. He also appears to have admitted that he was out of possession of the villages for a period of 10 years commencing from the year 1861 as he had mortgaged the villages to certain ryots for a certain sum of money in order to redeem a previous mortgage made to Bhagavat Subba Rao under the advice of Khanji Gumasta Giriamma's late husband Subba Rao and his (late Sridhara Rao's) agent

Col 19 Contd.

Balagulada Sanjivaiah: but that the term having expired with the year Prajathi 1871. he redeemed the mortgage.

He pointed out that as Balagolada Sanjivaiah was originally appointed an agent for the villages by his grand father he was looking after the duties and Subsequently his Son Krishnappa was appointed and continued to work do Still. Under these Circumstances he prayed the Deputy Commissioner in 18 that either the Said Krishnappa be confirmed as his agent or he be allowed to appoint any body else. In Support of his right and title over the Jodi villages he (late Sridara Rao) affairs. to have produced many documents & accounts, the principle of which Summed up by the by Commissioner major Hill are as follows:—

(1) Copy of a takeed dated Eashwara (1817) issued to the Sheikdar. In this the order of H. Late H granting the villages in Jodi to Narasimha moorthy achar, aswatha char etc, at the recommendation of Venkataramaniah, then an amildar who was exerting his best to increase the revenue are conveyed to Sheikdar for his guidance.

(2) Nirup dated 20 August 1829 issued by His Highness to Amildar Tammaiah of the both Ashagrame Taluk. By This H.H. ignores the Claim of Narasimhamurthy achar, aswathacha etc

to the joori villages in question as well as certain K.G. villages in the Patna, Astagram Taluk on the ground of their having failed to have the land cultivated and to pay the Stipulated joori to Govt and having executed a muchalika to Fouzdar Venkataramaniah and directs that they may be put in possession of the latter to be enjoyed for generations because he has been improving the villages greatly and laid the joori. It is also stated in the order that the grant was made not on account of those Brahmins but on account of the Fouzdar.

3. Partition deed dated 11 Jaista of Hevilambi (1837) executed to Sridhara Rao by Subba Rao his paternal uncle's son. By this Balamani etc., Jodi villages are made over to him as his direct share. This deed is attested by Aswathacharry one of the original Samasthans and Sanjiviah the pattigar of the joori village and also others.

4. A guttige Karar dated 10 Sravana Suddha of Sarvari (1840) executed to Sridhara Rao by one Subba Rao a gumasta of the Late Dy. Collector taking up the village on Contract.

5. Karar of 13th Palguna of Vikari (1840) executed by Narasimhamurthyachar and Venkalammawidow of Aswathacharry to Sridhara Rao. By this means they entered into a compromise and make over the villages to Sridhara Rao on condition of his giving 8 Krishnaraj Kandies of gram to them.

6. A Karar of 10 Palguna of Somya (1849) executed by Narasimha moorthiyachar to Sridara Rao. By this mortgage the 8 Candies of grain which Sridara Rao has promissed by means of a Stamped deed to be given him annually from Balamuri etc., Jodi villages until the different items of debt amounting to Rs 360/- are liquidated.

7. Razinamah of 17th March 1840 presented by Narasimha murthiyachar and Venkatamma to the Taluk Cutchery. By this they make over the villages in question to Sridhara Rao instead of renting them out in money pending the disposal of their claims as they have entered into a compromise and obtained a "Karar".

8. Karar 15 June 1842 executed by Narasimha murthiyachar to Sridhara Rao. By this he recognizes him as Sole heir of the villages in question and offers to look after the duties of the villages merely as an agent.

9. a letter dated 5th Ashada Suddha of Pyangala (1857) from Subba Rao to Sridara Rao in which he amongst other things alludes to some dispute that arose, when his father was the agent of the villages and speaks as if he was also an agent.

10. Karar dated 10 July 1861 executed by Subba Rao late husband of Giriamma to Sridhara Rao stating that he would mort-gage the Jodi villages on terms of "Sharaya Bhogya" in order to redeem previous mortgage.

Book 19 Contd/

11. There are also few other accounts, receipts and papers all Subservent to 1 Sridara Rao
12. Now on the other hand Giriamma Contends that She is the rightful party to appoint an agent for the villages in as much as She is the widow of Subba Rao who is the Son of Narasimhamurthyachar one of the original Sirnnadars and as a proof points out that a certain portion of a Jodi village has been given out in gift to one ~~Guruvaya~~ Girriya char and that the gift deed has been attested by Sreedhara Rao, but This deed is not produced.
13. She alludes to Some documents to Support her claims, but is unable to produce them on the ground that they were once presented to the Taluk Catchery, but were never returned to her.
14. The Amildar in Submitting for orders the disposition of the parties as well as other references produced by Sridara Rao States that the records [illegible] in favour of Sridara Rao.
15. On receipt of the report from the Amildar an order was issued to him from the by Comnr's office dated March 1874 under Cnr's Krishnamoorthi's Signature pointing out the inexpediency of his having Summarily entered into the matter and referring Sridara Rao to a regular Suit and directing the Continuance of the possession they were till Last year. of the Jodi Villages to the party in whose position

X

Subsequently the Complain above referred to was put in by Sridhara Rao.

16. Whereupon the Amildar was called upon to Submit a genealogical table of Sridhara Rao's family and to produce the original references in the possession of Giriamma

17. The Amildar now reports in his No: 1148 of 3rd December 1874 Stating Sridhara Rao has ~~prosecuted~~ presented a petition to Say that he will give the needful information in the Hoozur if notice be given ~~be given~~ to him beforehand which the Dft has failed to put in her appearance.

18. The following orders was passed by Major Hill, the Dy Comm^r.

" The chief point to determine is the "party in actual possession The Amildar "Should take evidence on this point from the "parties also take depositions from the "Shanbogues, Patels, and chief Ryots.

" If Giriamma is in possession She Should "explain why Jodi was not paid by her."

N. B.

" From the astagram Amils report No: 1189 dated 2nd January 1874 it will be Seen that Giriamma appears to have given the villages to one Raghavendra. chary on contract: whereas Sridhara Rao has produced 2/ vouchers to Show that he has been paying the Jodi amount through his agents upto the June 1873."

19. Then, after necessary enquiry being held the following orders were passed by the by Commy. Major Hill on 15th July 1875.

" A reference was made to the
" Commissioner by report No: 18 of the 5th 4th 1875
" requesting instructions whether the under
" Signed could interfere with the order of
" Mr. Krishnamoorthy given for Captain
" Canning who was an Officer of ~
" Co. ordinate jurisdiction. In reply the
" Commissioner has directed in his letter
" No 601 of the 5 July 1875 that the under-
" Signed may dispose of the matter on
" its merits.

The question raised is whether the
" authorities should recognize Ramabhadriah
" as agent of the Balamuri Inam. He
" has been appointed by Giriamma but
" the enquiry held distinctly shows that
" Sridhara Rao is the Inamdar, that
" he has paid the good that he mortgaged
" the inam through his agent & guardian
" to Bhagavat Subba Rao and Subse-
" quently redeemed it, and that Sub Rao
" the late husband of Giriamma has
" acted only as his agent: and as such
" had temporary management of the Estate.

Giriamma has endeavoured to
" establish a claim of her own by
" alledging that her late husband was
" descended from one of the originial
" Samadars: but it is proved that the

"Said Sanad was cancelled and She
" has brought forward no proof whatever
to establish her claim to appointing an
agent or to show possession as Inamdar.

Under these circumstances the ~~for~~
previous order passed by Mr. Krishna
murthi for the Dy Commr. ~~regarding~~
recognising Giriamma's agent must be
set aside and Sridhara Rao is per-
mitted to appoint an agent instead.

20 On 1st December 1875 the following
order was passed by Major Hill.

(a) In passing the previous order I was
mislead as to the actual facts of the case
which arose from the Deft not having
put in an appearance before the Amildar
and in consequence of the one sided
representation made by Krishnappa who
was formerly in charge of the Inam ~~Office~~
village.

(b) As before Stated the question for Settle-
ment is which of the two parties is in
actual possession and has right to
nominate an agent. The Inam has for
some time past been under mortgage
to different parties, the plaintiff Contending
that he was the mortgagor which the Defn
urges that the mortgages were made by
her late husband and father-in-law
on their own account and not as Simple
Agents as alleged by the Plaintiff. The
Jodi rent appears to have been paid to

40 Col: 19 Contd

to Govt by the manager who first stated
" that he acted for plaintiff, but now
recognises the Deft as also jodidar.
" under such circumstances it will be
" seen that the recent payment of jodi rent
" does not help much towards the determi
" nation of the point at issue.
" However receipts produced previous to the
" mortgage to Bhagavat Subba Rao appear
" in the names of Narasimha moorthy acher
" (Father-in-law) of Deft and others of the
" old Jodidars.
" (c) It is therefore requisite to decide
" the party who has been and is recognized
" as jodidar. It is evident that the Pffs'
grandfather was the means of the inam
" being obtained for the family. It is not
" necessary to determine whether the Second
" Sanad Cancelling the first is genuine
" or not but anyhow it appears that it
" has not been ofbly recognized as in the
" Several inam list Submitted to Govt
" the Defts' father in law is entered as
" jodidar and the claims of the other
" jodidars have been acquired by him.
" The Pffs has been urging his claim on
" the inam all along and on his instance
" it was once attached but released
" to the Defts' father in law on his furnish-
" ing Security as apparent from copy of an
" order Sent in 1841 by the Amildar
" of the Ongole Astagram Taluk to the

Shikdar embodying the Contents of an order given by the Sudr, and from a report to the Sudr informing that effect had been given to his order. This is last offl record forthcoming. In three instances the Offt and her husband as shown to have acted as Joodidars - the first in 1861 when Subba Rao ~~Rop~~ lodges a Complaint against the disposal of Land by Bhagavat Subba Rao the Second in 1863 when the Deft ~~offt~~ opposed the claim of Venkatamma a descendant of one of the original Joodidars and third in 1869-70 when deft sued Kunke Gowda.

D. The only point favouring the Plffs' assertion that a compromise was made subsequent to 1842 are two strange letters written by the father in law and husband of Deft, the first in Sowmya (1849) acquainting Plff of the mortgage of the Land to Bhagavat Subba Rao and accepting Rs 350 in lieu of the annual payment of 8 Candies of Paddy. The other in the year Parvangala (1857) in which the Offt's husband undertakes to clear the mortgage to Bhagavat Sub Rao by mortgaging the Land to the Ryots and promise to remit to him the proceeds of the Jody. The late Sarapathegar Sanjivaia appears also to have been in Communication with the Plaintiff

on the same subject as apparent from a letter written in 1844 and 1859. Against this there is the acquittance (yadowsi) given by Bhagavat Subba Rao in 1860 to the Defts late husband Subba Rao on re-demption by him of the mortgage: and intimation sent by him to Sanjivaiah the manager of the Dewn.

8. It is apparent that whatever the relations between the parties may have been the last order placing the Joshi in the possession of the Defts father in law is opposed to Pltffs claim and he seems never to have been subsequently recognised in any way by Govt as joshidar. While Giriamma (the Deft) has been so recognised since her husband's death. The present case is an attempt on the part of the Pltff to acquire a title without having recourse to law. His right to appoint an agent cannot therefore be recognised. The previous order dated 15th July 1875 is on review Cancelled and Dr Krishnamoorthy's order of March 1874 will stand good."

21. With reference to the above ~~named~~ orders. The villages are in possession of Giriyamma and Sridhara Rao, it is said died on the 1st may last. Bheema Rao Son of the late Sridhara Rao is represented by his guardian Sheshagiri Rao who states that Narasimhachar and Aswathachar were relation of the

of the late Fouzdar Venkataramaniah. that the first order or Sanad was issued in their names and three others by which it was meant that Venkataramaniah the then Amildar who obtained these gooi villages and his two Sons, that in his Capacity of an Amildar he could not then get these villages registered in his name: that though they were granted in the names of the above named individuals nominally he was in reality the holder thereof, that after he was promoted to the post of a Fouzdari of the Astagram &c there was no more necessity for him to be in the back ground and throw up the garb which he had worn in his Capacity as an Amildar, that the Second order of the late Maharaja of in 1829 the genuine of which was declined by the Dy Commr. to be established is plain on the subject, that after the issue of the Sanad till the order of the Dy Commr. dated 1.12.18[illegible] to Bheema Row's family was in the possession and enjoyment of the gooi village that though the former Sanad was formally Cancelled by the late Maharaja after the issue of the Second in the name of the present ——— Claimants great grand father yet Narasimhachar or otherwise called Narasimhamoorthyachar was deputed to look after the villages that from the ment the Payment of gooi was made by

Parpathegar for the time being and obtained receipts in their names which fact alone Cannot go to Establish the title to the villages of the Parpathegar or their heirs: That the orders of the Dy. Commr passed on the review are partial and unjust: That the Second Sannad of the Maharaja may be examined and its genuineness ~~may be examined~~ be declared: That as his father Sridhara Rao was deprived of the possession of the said villages by order of the Govt. he may be put in possession of them again without having recourse to any Law Suit, That Giriamma is only a widow of his parpathe-gar and that he is the legal representative and heir of the Granter Fouzdar Venkataramaniah his name be registered for the villages in question.

22. Giriamma is represented by her agent Raghavendra char who does not dispute the genuineness of the Second deed but States that the villages in question have been in the Enjoyment of her family ever-Since the villages were granted on its present tenure in the first instance by H. H. the Late Maharaja.

23. The possession of the villages for the time being is with Giriamma whether legally or otherwise the usual statement was therefore given to her agent to be filled in This office.

24. I have gone through the whole proceedings connected with this dispute and it is

necessary to submit my own views with regard thereto.

25. The first order of the Dy Commr. dated 15th July 1875 was in favour of the present claimants father Sridhara Rao, the second order dated 1st December of the same year was against him and quite averse to the former one and against which the Guardian of Bheema Rao Son of Sridhara Rao now complains. From this last order it is evident that the pooi of ~~his~~ late years was paid by the manager who made contradictory statements viz., one time Sridhara Rao as godidar and at other Giriamma. His first statement I think was correct. The genuineness of the second Sanad is not disputed before me which was examined by me and I am of opinion that it is a genuine document and as observed by the Dy Commr. in his last order para 6 it may be said that several instances came before me in which subsequent orders and documents were not noticed in the accounts but only the former entries were repeated. I dare say such instances are very common and the Jari accts will undoubtedly verify it. Because the II Sanad was not recognized by office record I think its genuineness cannot be doubted. The existence of the second Sanad and other documents ~~were~~ are more in favour of the minor claimant. But as he states that he has been dispossessed by order of the

the Govt. the question is whether or not his name be registered for the Inam and he be directed to go to a Civil Court to oust Giriamma from the position there. This point I think Should be Submitted for the orders of the Inam Supdt as the Guardian of Bheema Rao States that the possession of the villages in question was made over to Giriamma by the last order of the Dy Commr. Was it not for that I would have at once referred the party out of possession to a Civil Court.

26. There is a petition in This Office from one Krishna Rao Said to be a ~~Gumasta~~ Gnathi of Giriamma Stating that Giriamma is a heirless widow and as Such She cannot alienate This property in any way without the consent of ~~the~~ her reversioners that She has now leased out these 3 villages to one Katti Raghavendra Char to be enjoyed hereditarily and that the Same may be cancelled and the villages be registered in his name as reversioner. The Govt was informed in person that his claim is rather premature and as the title of Giriamma herself is in question he may come forward when it is Settled in one way or the other.

27. One Honnali Gururayachar has obtained ~~this~~ two Kandies of land in gift in Dattali C from Subba Rao husband of Giriamma in 1861 and wanted the Same to be registered in his name. This cannot

Col. 19 Contd

be done as it is a Subsequent alienation in a joody village and besides the title of the donor is in dispute.

(Sd) Syed Nasseruddin
Assistant.

	Name of village	Extent	Asstt	jody	whether jani or not	Proportionate Unit rent	Case No.	Reg: No.
A.	Balamuri jody	-	58.2.11	408.6.6	jani		1	12
B.	Anaijigehuna	-	185.5.6	185.5.6			1	13
C.	Ayedattitu	-	350.3.6				1	161
		Total	593.11.11	593.12.0				

Review by the Special
Assistant Commissioner
and Confirmation
by the Inam
Commissioner.

20

1. The Second Samaad has not been received with this reg: which will be returned to the Asstt: Supdt to ~~furnish~~ finish and attest his remarks in col: 19. He will also be requested to send the Second Samaad

2. It seems to me that the whole dispute is due to the Late Fouzdar having probably obtained the village in the names of others because he was the Amildar at the time We cannot, however, disturb the present enjoyment based as it is on a decision of the Bg: Commr. The village will therefore be registered in the names of the present Holders & the other party will be referred to the Civil courts to prove his claim.

8 Aug: 1879

(Sd) R. Cole
Superintendent

1. The Asstt Supdt has produced the Samaad in question I have compared the autographic portions with another

Col: 20 Contd

Sanad and the handwriting is Similar. though it is perhaps difficult to form an opinion. The words "Sridhara Swamy" usually at the foot of the Sanad is wanting. Apply to the Rev: Secy: for the Huzur copy.

(Sd) R. Cole
Supdt of I.S.

27 Aug 79.

It has now been decided that the name of Giriamma the present enjoyer Shiroti be registered and the claimant Bheema Rao be referred to Civil courts. Endorsements will be issued accordingly.

There is a petition in this office recd. from Duan Supdt bearing Camp No 41 of 20th ultimo from one Krishna Rao for report and Submission of the Register.

The Petitioner requests registry of this village in his name on the plea that Giriamma is a heirless widow and that her agent Kutty Raghavendracharlu in collusion with her wishes to make over with the property. Giriamma is no doubt a heirless and as such she cannot alienate the immoveable property. From the Genealogical tree furnished by the pr. it is clear that he is her husband's Gnathi and is therefore reversioner his name and the of other Gnathies may be registered until Giriamma be ordered to enjoy the vill until she is ousted by the Complainant Bheema Rao by a Civil Suit or till her

Col: 20 Contd

death and the Gratties can take possession of the villagers thereafter.

I beg here to add that Pety. Narasinga Rao States before me in open office before all the Inamdars This day that late Sridhara Rao was the ~~owner~~ real owner of the villages. This gives me a great Satisfaction to find that the conclusion arrived at by me was correct and now corroborated by the evidence of the adverse party himself.

Cantt. Mysore
3rd Octr 1879.

(Sd) Syed Nabbarnoor
Asstt.

1. I Concur. Their names may be entered and endorsements given to the petitioners accordingly.

23. Octr 1879.

(Initd) R. Cole
Supdt of I.S

2. The ~~Manager~~ Names of the reversioners are merely to be noted in the regr. and T.D in Giriamma's name.

(Initd) R. Cole
Supdt.

13. 2. 80

3. With reference to the orders passed on the 27 August 1879 the Secy, in the Correspondence ending with his Docket No $\frac{5740}{100}$ of 29-4-1880 States that there are no references in his records regarding the grant of the Samad referred to, and forwards the ganabundy etc., accts dated from 1805-6 to 1833. These accts have been examined, and in none of them is allusion made to the Samad referred to.

Col: 20 Contd

4. Confirmed on the Jodi of 593-12-0
plus $\frac{1}{8}$ quit rent on the difference 69.12.6

663.8.6

or Rs 664/-

5. This village is subject to the payment of all Local Funds & Irrigation cesses.

6. All Govt. rights to Sayer, Abkari & Forests are reserved.

7. A valuation Survey is desired.

(Sd) R. Cole
Superintendent.

5.6.1880.

8. The names of reversioners as per Genealogical tree filed with the Corresp. ending with the Bangalore annls No. 913/967 of the 19th October 1880 are,

1. Lakshminarasappa alias Koosappa
2. Rangamah (3) Venkataramaniah
4. Sreenivasamoorthi.

(Sd) R. Cole
Superintendent

9. Vide the Petn of Girianma, the party in Col: 15- No. 367 dated 26 Febr/84 wherein that the Venkata ~~Rao~~ given to Katte Raghavendrachar has been Cancelled her and requesting not to issue any Copy or papers connected with the to him hereafter

(Sd) J. P. Grant
Superintendt

17-3-1884.

Col: 20 Contd

10 Revised as per the Govt. Pros: No. 14223-5 / P.7.100-93 dated 17 February 1894.

11. Vide the Statement received with the Sur: Supdts yadi No 286 dated 22nd may 1897

	A.	G	Rs.
Total area at assth	348.	13.	249—0—0

Particulars.

Uncultivable	52.	22	0 - 12—0
Dry Cultivated	208.	25	163. 0. 0
Cultivable (waste)	1.	7	8. 4. 0 + assessment
Garden Cultivated	25	39	77—0—0
Total	348.	13	249—0—0

Former yoori ——— 5 93 - 12—0

1/8 Q.R on the difference of Rs ———

12. The Sur: valuation is less than the old yoori & quit rent of this villages is therefore Confd. on the full assth Survey valuation viz, Rs 249—0—0. Vide the authority quoted in Govt Pros No 17989 / R 2585- dated 20.4.95.

Finally Confirmed accordingly.

(Sd) J. P. Grant
Supdt of S. Settlt

27-7-97

13. Vide the correspondence ending with French Rocks Sub Division Officers yoori No 411 / 129 dated 25th Septr. 1900..

Col: 20 Contd.

14. The above mentioned revision cancelled and it has been revised as follows: —

Survey Akar of this village	—	249 — 0 — 0
— Do — of Anajgepura	—	520 - 4 — 0
— Do — of Yedathittu	—	897 - 6 — 0
Total		1666 - 10 — 0
Deduct old Jodi	—	593 - 12 — 0
1/8 Q.R on the difference of Rupees. 1072 - 14 — 0		134 - 1 - 9
Total		727 - 13 - 9
or avoiding fractions	—	728 — 0 — 0

15. Finally confirmed accordingly.

(Sd) J. P. Grant
Superintendent

23. 10. 1900.

"Copy"

Inam Supdt's office
Bangalore dt 4.12.16

Superintendent of
Inam Settlements.

1916. AV

FROM

THE SUPERINTENDENT,
INAM SETTLEMENTS IN MYSO

To

THE SECY. TO THE GOVT. OF
H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF M

Dated } 14th Decr
Despatched }

No. 60

Enc. one

SUBJECT.

Copy of the Inam Regr.
goor Balamuri ville
Srirangapatam Taluk.

G.R.S. 26]

SUBJECT.....

Section VII
File No. 302-15
Serial No. 9

Diary No. of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
, *the* 191 .

No. 1574

Endorsement-

Date of issue 26. 12. 1916

Signed by M. Srinivasa Ayyar

To

X address

over.

By Order

Sd.
18.12.16
For Secy to Govt-
Genl Deptt.

Recd
amm
18/12/16

No. 1575 Enclosure dy 26-12-1916

List of enclosures.

Copy to the Deputy Commr
Mysore Dt for information
with ref to his letter No: 662 dy 30-6-16

WWS
19/12

B.O
Sd.
18.12.16
For Secy to Govt-
Genl Deptt

Copied by

Examined by

amm
18/12/16

GPE—20,000—11211